I negate,

To negate means “**to deny the truth of**” which implies **a)** presume neg since negating has no positive connotation and **b)** indicting assumptions negates since it denies that the resolution can be true by making it logically incoherent. Prefer substantive reasons to theoretical ones, since if I win that we ought to see the resolution as false then the debate isn’t a tie – I did the better debating by showing we should negate. Moreover, statements are more likely false than true.

Ought implies function not a moral obligation. **Anscombe[[1]](#footnote-1)**

**The term**s “should” or “**ought**” or “needs” **relate to good and bad: e.g. machinery needs oil, or should or ought to be oiled**, in that running without oil is bad for it, or it runs badly without oil. According to this conception, of course, **"should" and "ought" are not used in a special "moral" sense** **when one says that a man should not bilk**. (In Aristotle's sense of the term "moral" [ήθικός], they are being used in connection with a moral subject‑matter: namely that of human passions and [non‑technical] actions.) But **they have now acquired a special so‑called "moral" sense**-‑i.e. a sense in which they imply some absolute verdict (like one of guilty/not guilty on a man) **on what is described in the "ought" sentences used in certain types of context:** not merely the contexts that Aristotle would call "moral"‑-passions and actions‑-but also some of the contexts that he would call "intellectual."

Prefer this interp:

A. Reciprocity- My definition is the most fair because it is harder for the negative to prove something is not consistent with a moral obligation than for the aff to prove it is consistent. Meaning that only my definition allows for reciprocal burdens because a) it doesn’t prescribe a moral action but the function of an object, b) it forces us to debate about the function of a just government which is what the resolution is innately asking for making the round the most predictable for both debaters.

B. Common Usage- When we say something ought to have a specific a specific result we don’t mean to prescribe action but rather define its function. For instance if I say x is not working than we say we ought to do y to x, meaning that when we describe the function of y not a moral obligation to do y. In addition, specific entities can’t prescribe action but can have a function, which means only this definition makes universal sense.

C. Education- Defining ought as function best promotes education a) it forces us to debate the topic not some moralsy framework. This is especially important for the first debate on the topic such as because it forces us to engage the topic lit before we get sick of the topic. In addition, Moralsy frameworks don’t promote education because it incentivizes debaters to read the same Kaursguard cards every topic instead of cutting topical prep. Specifically on this topic, which requires economic weighing, actions specifying the function of a government in an economic round are the most educational and predictable.

# The function of the jury is to vote solely based on the fact patern. Citizen Information.com: <http://www.citizensinformation.ie/en/justice/courtroom/jury.html> “Role of the jury”; 2014 PE

**The jury fulfills a very important function in the legal system**. You are entitled to be tried by jury inless the alleged offence is a minor one or one that is being tried in the [Special Criminal Court](http://www.citizensinformation.ie/en/justice/courts_system/special_criminal_court.html). However, a jury is not required in every legal case. There will be a jury in some civil cases such as defamation and assault cases. However, for the majority of civil cases such as personal injuries actions and family law cases, there is no jury - it is the [judge](http://www.citizensinformation.ie/en/justice/courtroom/judge.html) who decides the outcome. **The jury consists of 12 members** of the public who sit in a box to one side of the judge. One of the jurors is selected as a foreman of the jury by the members of the jury before the case starts. He or she acts as an informal chairperson and spokesperson for the jury. The 12 jurors in a case are selected from a number of people who have been called to do their jury service on that day.Section 23 of the [Courts and Civil Law (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 2013](http://www.irishstatutebook.ie/2013/en/act/pub/0032/sec0023.html#sec23) amended the [Juries Act 1976](http://www.irishstatutebook.ie/1976/en/act/pub/0004/index.html) so that the jury can consist of up to 15 members, if the case is expected to last more than 2 months. **The jurors are charged with the responsibility of deciding whether, on the facts of the case, a person is guilty or not guilty of the offence for which he or she has been charged. The jury must reach its verdict by considering only the**[**evidence**](http://www.citizensinformation.ie/en/justice/evidence/evidence_introduction.html)**introduced in court** and the directions of the judge. **The jury does not interpret the law.** **It follows the directions of the judge as regards legal matters.**

Jury nullification undermines the law and is not within the functional capacity of the Jury. **Niewert:** David Niewert (freelance journalist). “Spreading Extremism.” Orcinus. 10 Octo- ber 2003.<http://dneiwert.blogspot.com/archives/2003_10_05_dneiwert_archive.html>

**There is** in fact **a long history of** , **jury nullification** both **in American** and English law -- cases in **which the jurors simply ignored the requirements of the law** and set the accused free. However, it has primarily been viewed as a malfunction of the law, not as a positive principle to be practiced . "**Nullification is, by definition, a violation of a pro, oath to apply the law** as instructed by the court,. according to a 1997 federal ruling, the strongest, most recent court decision on the topic. The opinion by Judge Jo. Cabranes said ,**jurors who reject the law should not be allowed to serve**; when the ruling was appealed, the courts upheld, but also ordered a new trial after declaring that only ',unambiguous evidence" of a pro, disregard of the law can ,justify his dismiss. Other ,jurists have been equally clear about the actual standing of pry nullification: "**It is a recipe for anarchy** . . [when pros] are allowed to substitute personal whims for the stable and established law -- Colorado circuit Judge Frederic B. Rodgers "Jury nullification is indefensible, because, by definition, it amounts to pror pegury -- that is ,jurors lying under oath by deciding a ca. contrary to the law and the evidence after they have sworn to decide the case according to the law and the evidence -- D.C. Superior court Judge Nenry F Greene **In essence, ,jury nullification** -- **by sitting in judgment not ,just the facts of the case but of the laws themselve**s -- arrogates to itself not only the role of the ,judge but of the legislature, essentially overturning at whirr those laws that have been pas.d through democratic processes. In this sense, j,ury nullification **is a threat not only to the courts, but to the very systems of laws on which the nation rests.**
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